



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CORRESPONDENCE.

C. H. MOORE'S "GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE."

To the Managing Editor of the American Journal of Archæology.

Sir :—In the course of your review of my book, *Development and Character of Gothic Architecture*, published on pp. 145–50 of this volume of your Journal, you make some remarks, and some strictures, to which I beg leave to say a few words in reply.

I cannot agree with your assertion, that *Viollet-le-Duc's geographical division of French schools was shattered by Quicherat* (p. 147). There is no necessary conflict between such a division and that which Quicherat proposed. The geographical division has a firm basis of truth (founded, as it is, on peculiarities that grew out of ethnological distinctions and local conditions), which renders it serviceable and convenient. Quicherat's classification may have its value, but it does not supersede that of Viollet-le-Duc.

You say (p. 148): *It is apparent that, from confining his attention almost exclusively to Gothic structures, Mr. Moore has an imperfect acquaintance with Romanesque monuments. He would not otherwise have asserted (p. 16) that Romanesque builders rarely vaulted their naves, or have supposed (and marvelled at it) that semi-tunnel vaults over aisles were brought into use to support cross-vaults over the nave (p. 12); whereas, as a matter of fact, they were first used, in Provence, to sustain the thrust of the tunnel-vaults of the nave, thus explaining their raison-d'être.* The context, however, shows that I am speaking, on page 16, of the early Romanesque builders of North-Western Europe, and of these, I believe, it is correct to say that they rarely vaulted their naves. The common practice with them was to cover the nave with a timber roof only—as shown, for instance, by M. Lefèvre-Pontalis in plates II and III of his *Étude Historique et Archéologique sur la nef de la Cathédrale du Mans*. Quicherat, in his essay *L'Architecture Romane*, refers to some of the unvaulted churches of Northern France as exceptional: but they are by no means exceptional in this region. When such important buildings as the Abbaye-aux-Hommes, the Abbaye-aux-Dames, and St.-Nicolas of Caen, Mt. St.-Michel, Juniéges, Mans, Guibray and St.-Gervais of Falaise, and many others, had only timber roofs, it can hardly be said that the vaulting of naves was the general practice. And, in fact, so far from common was it that M. V. Ruprich-Robert, one of the

most learned of French architects, and a close student of Romanesque buildings, says (p. 26), after speaking on this point in his monograph on the Abbaye-aux-Dames: *Et l'on conclura de tout ceci qu'un système de charpentes apparentes était généralement adopté à cette époque, par les Normands, pour couvrir les édifices religieux.* I may add that Quicherat himself—in his unfinished *Cours d'Archéologie* (*Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire*, vol. 2, p. 455), written thirty years after the essay *L'Architecture Romane*—admits that the naves of Norman churches were, at first, not vaulted. Regarding the semi-tunnel vault, I have not supposed that it was brought into use (*i. e.*, first used) to support cross-vaults. I merely say (p. 12) that *the expedient was adopted* of employing such vaults in connection with the sexpartite vaulting of St.-Stephens at Caen.

It is incorrect to say (p. 148) that I decline to call any English or Spanish buildings Gothic, because they are either purely French (*sic*) and therefore do not belong to the country, or because they have received local modifications and are therefore not purely French. I do not decline to call buildings Gothic on any such grounds. I decline to call them Gothic only when they fail to exhibit a Gothic system. You say (p. 149): *One cannot fail to see that Mr. Moore is inclined to magnify divergences, and sometimes even to indulge in what resembles sophistry. He fully endorses a link in transitional Gothic, such as Laon or Noyon or Senlis, where the wall-space, for example, is still largely preserved, and the windows have not yet occupied the entire space between the wall-ribs; but he would deny the Gothicity of such an arrangement in a Spanish or English building erected ten or twenty years later, because in the meantime French architecture had reached a more advanced stage.* This is erroneous. Such transitional buildings in France as Noyon, Senlis, and Laon I regard as Gothic, notwithstanding that considerable wall-spaces remain in them, because they display a growing Gothic system. But I can see no propriety in calling buildings of an advanced period Gothic in which heavy walls remain, as a final condition, essential to the structure, and in which there is no consistent development of a Gothic framework.

I am charged (p. 149) with many grave errors in what I have said of Italian pointed architecture—three of which are said to be contained in my opening statements respecting Italy. These statements are correctly quoted as follows: *During the twelfth century Gothic architecture had no marked influence upon Italy. The church of S. Andrea of Vercelli, which is said to have been begun in 1219, gives evidence, in its Gothic vaulting system, of transalpine influence; but it is an exceptional instance, and it was not before the middle of the thirteenth century that Italy began really to yield, in some measure, to the taste for pointed design.* You say (p. 149) that the church of S. Andrea at Vercelli, instead of standing as a solitary instance, is

but one in a long series which begins about 1170. I presume you refer mainly to the Cistercian edifices which are the subject of your interesting article entitled *Introduction of Gothic Architecture into Italy*. But, granting that these monuments ought to be classed with S. Andrea of Vercelli, does their sporadic existence in the country warrant the belief that Gothic architecture had a marked influence upon Italy (*i. e.*, upon the Italian builders)? Did the Italian people, at this time, show any disposition to adopt pointed forms in their own architecture (which is, of course, the question with which I am concerned in my book) before the middle of the thirteenth century? It seems to me that the incoming of French Cistercian monks, with their own architecture, interesting as that architecture undoubtedly is, has little bearing upon my main proposition.

Your remark that *Siena is not pointed* must, I think, have been made inadvertently. Any photograph will show that it is so for the most part; though, as in many other Italian buildings in which the pointed arch is used, it is not consistently employed throughout. And, though the nave of Orvieto be not vaulted, the transept and east end are, and it is, you will doubtless admit, commonly and not incorrectly, classed among leading Italian Gothic edifices. My assertion that both Siena and Orvieto differ little (structurally of course) from other pointed buildings in Italy is, I maintain, correct.

With regard to apsidal aisles and flying buttresses, the instances that you cite may show that my statement that they never occur is too strong. But to adduce these unusual instances does not materially weaken my argument. The apsidal aisle is certainly so rare that it may at least be said that it was not a characteristic of Italian pointed design. And anything like a flying-buttress is so uncommon that it must be reckoned equally foreign to the architecture of the country.

I agree with you that my treatment of German, Italian, and Spanish architecture might, with advantage, be fuller; but you have not, I think, shown that it is, in any important respects, incorrect.

CHARLES H. MOORE.

Cambridge, Mass.,

October 9, 1890.

Mr. Charles H. Moore.

Sir:—In writing my review of your book, I was guided by the opinion that it was a work of such importance that it must be carefully studied and both praised and criticised with discrimination. You will pardon me if I therefore discuss somewhat in detail your rejoinder to some of my criticisms to which you take exception.

I. The question of the relative merits of Viollet-le-Duc's geographical division of French monuments and Quicherat's structural division is one that depends largely on individual opinion and is difficult of settlement. There being no mention of Quicherat among your authorities, I concluded that you were not familiar with him. He would otherwise have been a welcome supporter of your own system which, like his, is purely structural to the exclusion of æsthetic elements. To me it seems that your own principle would force you to grant, that a geographical division can be used only in subordination to one that is structural and based upon the vaulting system employed. This is Quicherat's plan, and is the only one that is based on a scientific principle: it has been followed by many, for instance, by Corroyer in his recent volume *Architecture Romane*. Even those who still support the geographical schools, like Anthyme Saint-Paul,¹ call attention to the inadequacy of Viollet-le-Duc's division and the small number of buildings on which he based it. This is in strong contrast with Quicherat's broad knowledge of the monuments.

II. As this is hardly the place to discuss the defects of the geographical division, I shall pass to the second point, which involves the essential character of Romanesque architecture, which you appear to regard as a style characterized by wooden roofs, in opposition to the generally received opinion that it is based on the use of the vault. I fail to see that your remarks on Romanesque can be confined strictly to the Northwest:² on p. 7 they are applied to Western Europe and include Northern Italy, France, Germany and England, for you say: *The Romanesque may be broadly divided into two styles—the Eastern and the Western; and the variety of Western Europe may be said to be of one style in North Italy, of another in Southern Gaul, of another in Normandy and England, etc.* (p. 7). On the following pages, after alluding to churches of Northern Italy, the references made to the processes of Romanesque as distinguished from Roman builders (pp. 9, 11, 12, 15) are not limited by any terms "Northwestern" or even "Western," and your assertion on p. 12 to which I alluded in my review is as follows: *A beginning was made in the direction of further progress when the Romanesque builders began to vault their naves*. The very ascription to the whole Romanesque style of peculiarities confined mainly to Normandy argued the imperfect acquaintance with Romanesque as a whole to which I alluded. In fact, in your book, among all the main pro-

¹ *Viollet-le-Duc, ses travaux d'art et son système archéologique*, pp. 154-78.

² The reference to "North-Western Europe" on p. 16 appears to apply merely to oblong compartments, as is shown by Note 1. As French Romanesque was mainly developed in the centre and south, it is out of the question to omit these regions. It was not north of the Loire (p. 28), but south of it, that the new style of architecture was in process of development.

vincial schools in France only that of Normandy is studied : those of equal importance in the east, centre, and south of France (as, for example, the schools of Burgundy, Poitou, Perigord, Auvergne, the Loire, *etc.*) are hardly alluded to, and no buildings belonging to them are studied. It seems to me that to this omission is due your error in holding to the prevalence of wooden roofs. Everyone knows that the early Norman churches had wooden roofs and were not vaulted until later, and that it was in this very respect that they differed from the buildings south of the Loire, which were primitively vaulted. It is useless, therefore, to cite a list of monuments with wooden roofs in Normandy and the north (which might, by consulting Dehio and Bezold, be made many times as long); for this is not disputed. For the same reasons the opinions of Ruprich-Robert and Quicherat which you quote, applying only to Norman architecture, do not affect the question. To say (p. 12) that the *twelfth century* vaults of the *Abbaye-aux-Hommes* at Caen *are among the earliest that were constructed over a nave*, and to speak of a time in the late Romanesque period when *the Romanesque builders began to vault their naves*, appeared to me to argue two things: first, a misapprehension of the fundamental character of Romanesque, which is essentially a vaulted style from its very beginnings; second, an unfamiliarity with the monuments of Central and Southern France which still have vaulted naves of the eleventh century, and a lack of acquaintance with such proofs as Quicherat has brought forward, in abundance,³ to show that it was the adoption of the vault in the first decade of the eleventh century which produced the change from the late Latin to what we term the Romanesque style. The churches of the eleventh century which we find to have had a nave covered with a wooden roof are merely survivals or reversals due to two causes: conservatism and the ill-success, through imperfect knowledge of the laws of statics, of many of the earlier attempts at vaulting. But when, even in these early cases, the wooden roof is preserved, we find the new proportions and other elements brought in by the vaulting system to be present in them also. I may therefore safely assert that it was not (as you say it was) the common practice of the Romanesque builders of Western Europe to cover the nave with a timber roof only, and that such an opinion is contrary to the very character of Romanesque architecture, which is as essentially a vaulted style as is the Gothic.

III. With reference to my contention, that the term Gothic should be allowed, for example, to some of the churches of Spain and England, your reply is, that you decline to call them Gothic only when they fail to exhibit a Gothic system. Now, there can be no *when*, because in your

³QUICHERAT, *Mélanges*; *Arch. du Moyen Age*, p. 114, sqq.

very preface (p. vi) we read that Gothic architecture was *never practised elsewhere than in France*. This is a geographical limitation. On p. 198, when it is recognized that such buildings as Burgos, Toledo, and Leon are Gothic in the main, the only variation from the developed French type which can be found is the smaller size of the windows; a variation which has no effect whatever upon the purely Gothic constructional principles, and is a matter of suitability, being caused merely by the more southern climate, as you have allowed. Spanish architecture has therefore a perfect right to be called Gothic even on your own showing. In regard to the wall-spaces left in early French-Gothic buildings, I can only repeat, that when you find the same in buildings outside of France you appear to refuse to call them Gothic: the result is that we are asked to consider two buildings essentially alike to belong to two different styles, one Gothic the other "pointed," when there is no structural difference of any importance between them.

IV. *Italian Architecture*. While acknowledging the inaccuracy of your statement, that apsidal aisles and flying buttresses were never used in Italy, you maintain the correctness of your assertion, that the cathedrals of Siena and Orvieto *differ little from other vaulted pointed buildings in Italy*. Now, in both these churches the structural arches are not pointed but round, only such secondary forms as windows being pointed; and you yourself tell us (p. 7) that "pointed arches in apertures do not much differ structurally from round ones:" this shows the inconvenience of substituting the term "pointed" for Gothic. Orvieto has a wooden roof to its nave and structural round arches: there are not in it any structural pointed elements whatever. Siena is certainly vaulted, but the vaults differ from those usually found in Tuscan and Northern churches in being flatter and more oblong. In both buildings, the effect is made quite different by the closeness, greater length, and slenderness of the piers and columns, a point in which they more nearly approach the basilical Romanesque churches of Tuscany. There is more reason to call the churches of Sicily pointed than to give this name to the cathedral of Orvieto. In fact these two churches, while having hardly anything in common, differ in almost every way from the pointed monastic churches with which you compare them, and these differences affect the vaulting, supports, forms, and proportions.

I can add an interesting instance of the early use of the flying-buttress in Italy. It is in the brick church of Sta. Maria di Castagnola, near Jesi, of Franco-North-Italian extraction and Cistercian parentage, built between 1172 and 1196.⁴

⁴ The flying-buttress is certainly used near the transept: the rest of the buttresses rise considerably above the roof of the aisles, but it is difficult to ascertain whether they were originally solid as they now are.

The point of special importance, however, is the general statement (p. 181) which forms the starting-point of your study, namely, that the pointed church of S. Andrea at Vercelli built in 1219 is an exceptional instance, and, that pointed design did not begin to spread in Italy until about 1250. In answer to my former criticism, you suggest that, like S. Andrea at Vercelli, the early churches I refer to were the work of foreign architects, and assume them to be Cistercian constructions. I am asked to prove that native Italian architects adopted pointed forms before the middle of the thirteenth century. This I will do by printing here a list of over sixty transitional and pointed churches and monastic buildings built in Italy between 1170 and 1250, most of which were erected not by French Cistercian monks but by native architects. To many of these I have given personal study. Some, like Fossanova, S. Martino al Cimino at Viterbo, S. Leo on the borders of Umbria and the Marches, and perhaps S. Maria d'Arbona near Chieti, appear to be by French architects. This leaves an overwhelming majority by the hand of native Italians who at times (as at Casamari and San Galgano) exactly followed French models, at other times (as at Sezze, Ferentino, and Viterbo) introduced considerable novelties. As time went on, these divergences became greater, as can be seen in the buildings erected between 1220 and 1250. Each large Cistercian monastery exercised the strongest influence in favor of the spread of pointed forms over a considerable radius, so that we find cathedrals and parish-churches, and even secular buildings, built in this style as early as the first years of the thirteenth century. The early school of the North was not so closely connected with the Cistercians, and greater independence was shown. By 1225, the pointed style had spread over a large part of Central and Southern Italy, and, when the two new monastic orders then adopted it, they found it no great novelty. A considerable list could be given of pointed buildings of both Franciscan and Dominican orders erected in the Papal States before 1250. It is my intention to illustrate in detail in my series of papers on *The Introduction of Gothic Architecture into Italy* the greater part of the monuments enumerated in the following list. The inevitable conclusion is, that the pointed style was known in Italy, within certain circles of Cistercian and other French influence, between c. 1175 and 1220; and that it was then carried over a large part of Italy between 1220 and 1250 by the Dominican and Franciscan orders, who adopted it from the Cistercians. I am therefore able to antedate your period for the spread of pointed forms by at least a half-century, and, by proving that the architects of most of such churches were Italians and not foreigners, I am enabled to answer in the affirmative your query: *Did the Italian people, at this time, show any disposition to adopt pointed forms in their own architecture before the middle of the thirteenth century?*

EXAMPLES OF POINTED ARCHITECTURE IN ITALY
FROM ABOUT 1170 TO 1250.⁵

Northern group.

1. 1185. *Alessandria*: S. Maria del Carmine.⁶
2. 1189–1215. *Vezzolano*: S. Maria.⁷
3. c. 1215. *Asti*: Cathedral.⁸
4. c. 1230. *Asti*: S. Secondo.⁹
5. 1227. *Milano*: S. Eustorgio.¹⁰
6. 1228. *Milano*: Palazzo Pubblico.¹¹
7. 1215. *Como*: Broletto.¹²
8. 1217. *Bologna*: S. Martino dell' Aposa.¹³
9. c. 1220–30. *Bologna*: S. Maria della Misericordia.¹⁴
10. c. 1221–30. *Bologna*: S. Domenico.¹⁵
11. 1226. *Bologna*: Palazzo del Podestà.¹⁶
12. 1231–86. *Bologna*: S. Giovanni in Monte.¹⁷
13. 1236–45. *Bologna*: S. Francesco.¹⁸

⁵ In this list are included a number of monuments which are only in part pointed; several of whose pointed character I am not quite certain (such are numbers 2, 15, 32, 56), and a few that are now destroyed or remodelled. With two or three exceptions I am personally acquainted with all those that belong to the Middle group, and with, perhaps, one-half of the Northern and Southern groups, and have as evidence my photographs and notes. For the rest I have relied on descriptions or drawings. Some buildings that may appear of but slight individual importance have been included as showing the spread of the style. The list could have been swelled by many doubtful examples. From it have been excluded some Franciscan, Dominican, and other buildings whose date is unknown, though their style is early. It does not include any of the pointed buildings of Sicily and Southern Italy that arose under Oriental influence; nor those, like the Cistercian church of Valvisciolo (c. 1151), which are in the same plain pointed style as the French buildings of Perigord. I give these numerous references to MOTHES more for the purpose of verification than because his descriptions are at all adequate.

⁶ MOTHES, *Die Baukunst des Mittelalters in Italien*: Jena, 1884, 443.

⁷ MOTHES, *ibid.*; SCHNAASE, VII, 105; RICCI, *Storia dell'architettura in Italia*, II, 191; REBER, *History of Mediæval Art*, 566.

⁸ MOTHES, 447, *sqq.* Cf. CHAPUY, *Le Moyen Age monumental*; OSTEN, *Les Monum. de la Lombardie*, pls. XVII, XVIII.

⁹ MOTHES, 448.

¹⁰ MOTHES, 450; CAFFI, *Descrizione*.

¹¹ STREET, *Brick and Marble architecture in North Italy*, p. 329, fig. 59; MOTHES, 453, fig. 131; RICCI, II, 196.

¹² MOTHES, 453–4; STREET, 340, fig. 63. ¹³ MOTHES, 457; RICCI, II, 279, 317.

¹⁴ MOTHES, 456–7; OKELY, *Christian Architecture in Italy*, pl. I, 5.

¹⁵ MOTHES, 458–9; THODE, *Franz von Assisi*, 1885, 334.

¹⁶ MOTHES, 456; RICCI, II, 140.

¹⁷ MOTHES, 456; RICCI, II, 137. ¹⁸ THODE, 331–4; Photographs; MOTHES, 457.

14. 1219-24. *Vercelli*: S. Andrea.
15. 1180-1200. *Genova*: S. Giovanni di Prè.¹⁹
16. 1226-30. *Parma*: S. Francesco del Prato.²⁰
17. c. 1240. *Piacenza*: S. Francesco.²¹
18. c. 1240. *Piacenza*: S. Giovanni di Canale.²²
19. 1223-54. *Brescia*: Broletto.²³
20. 1232-1350. *Padova*: S. Antonio.

Middle Group.

21. 1170-80. *Fondi*: Cathedral.²⁴
22. 1172-96. *Jesi* (near): S. Maria di Castagnola.²⁵
23. 1173. *S. Leo*: Cathedral.²⁶
24. c. 1178-1215. *Fossanova*: Monastery.²⁷
25. } { *Piperno*: Communal Palace.²⁸
26. } { *Sezze*: Cathedral.²⁹
27. } c. 1200. { *Sermoneta*: Cathedral.³⁰
28. } { *Sermoneta*: S. Michele.³¹
29. } { *Sermoneta*: S. Nicola.³²
30. c. 1190-96. *Ceccano*: S. Maria de Flumine.³³
31. 1151-1217. *Casamari*: Monastery.³⁴
32. c. 1200. *Ponticelli*: S. Maria di Colle.³⁵
33. 1200-1250. *Ferentino*: S. Maria.³⁶
34. 1207. *Spoletto*: Cathedral (façade).³⁷
35. c. 1200-25. *Anagni*: Cathedral (rear).³⁸
36. c. 1207-25. *Viterbo*: S. Martino al Cimino.³⁹

¹⁹ MOTHES, 654-5.

²⁰ MOTHES, 455.

²¹ MOTHES, 742.

²² MOTHES, 742.

²³ MOTHES, 444, 450.

²⁴ SCHULZ, II, 132; MOTHES, 683-4.

²⁵ MOTHES, 440; my Photographs and Notes; SCHNAASE, VII, 87; AGINCOURT, *Hist. de l'Art*, pls. xxxvi, xlii, etc.; DEHIO and BEZOLD, *Die kirchliche Baukunst des Abendlandes*, pl. cxcvi, 5, 6.

²⁶ AGINCOURT, pl. xxxvi, 20, 21; SCHNAASE, VII, 87; MOTHES, 441, etc.

²⁷ My article in JOURNAL, VI, 10-46.

²⁸⁻³² My Photographs and Notes. Cf., also, for some of these buildings, MOTHES, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

³³ My Notes and Photographs.

³⁴ L. DE PERSIIS, *La Badia o trappa di Casamari*; Illustrations in OKELY, *Christian Architecture in Italy*, pl. III, 2; and in DEHIO and BEZOLD, pl. cXLVI, 3; References in RICCI, MOTHES, SCHNAASE, etc.; my Photographs and an unpublished Article written for the JOURNAL.

³⁵ RICCI, II, 38.

³⁶ MOTHES, 689; *La Mostra della Città di Roma*, etc., x; my Photographs and Notes.

³⁷ ALINARI's photograph; RICCI and MOTHES, etc.

³⁸ Photographs by Alinari.

³⁹ My article in JOURNAL, vol. VI, 299.

37. 1209. *Chieti* (near): S. Maria d'Arbona.⁴⁰
 38. 1201-48. *Siena* (near): Monastery of S. Galgano.⁴¹
 39. *Roma*: Church at Capo di Bove.⁴²
 40. c. 1227. *Teramo*: S. Francesco.⁴³
 41. 1230. *Ascoli*: Porta di Solesta.⁴⁴
 42. 1230. *Corneto*: S. Francesco.⁴⁵
 43. *Corneto*: S. Pancrazio.⁴⁶
 44. 1221-44. *Viterbo*: S. Maria ai Gradi.⁴⁷
 45. 1230-40. *Viterbo*: S. Francesco.⁴⁸
 46. c. 1220-40. *Subiaco*: Monastery (details).⁴⁹
 47. *Perugia*: S. Francesco.⁵⁰
 48. c. 1240. *Perugia*: S. Giuliana.⁵¹
 49. c. 1220. *Perugia* (near): S. Salvatore di Monte l'Abate.⁵²
 50. 1230. *Cortona*: S. Francesco.⁵³
 51. 1230-40. *Orvieto*: S. Francesco.⁵⁴
 52. c. 1225. *Siena*: S. Domenico.⁵⁵
 53. *Sutri*: S. Francesco.⁵⁶
 54. 1234. *Spoletto*: S. Paolo.⁵⁷
 55. 1235. *Spoletto*: S. Tommaso.⁵⁸
 56. bef. 1250. *Pietramala*: S. Domenico.⁵⁹

Southern Group.

57. 1209-53. *Rapolla*: Cathedral.⁶⁰
 58. c. 1200. *San Leonardo*: Church.⁶¹
 59. c. 1188-1214. *Pontone*: S. Eustacchio.⁶²

⁴⁰ MOTHES, p. 697; DEHIO and BEZOLD, pl. CXCVI, 2; my Photographs and Notes.

⁴¹ Photographs by Lombardi. Cf. L. DE PERSIIS, *op. cit.*, for date.

⁴² MOTHES, 696-7; AGINCOURT, XXXVI, 18, 19; XLII, 14-17.

⁴³ SCHULZ, II, 12; MOTHES, 701; PANNELLA, *Guida illustrata di Teramo*.

⁴⁴ MOTHES, 701; SCHULZ, II, 7. ⁴⁵ MOTHES, 669, 701. ⁴⁶ MOTHES, 683, 710.

⁴⁷ CRISTOFORI, *Le tombe dei Papi in Viterbo e le chiese di S. Maria in Gradi, di S. Francesco, e di S. Lorenzo*, 1887, p. 62 and *passim*.

⁴⁸ MOTHES, 719; CRISTOFORI, p. 149 and *passim*.

⁴⁹ L. DEGLI ABBATI, *Da Roma a Solmona*, 29; Photographs; AGINCOURT, *passim*.

⁵⁰ GUARDABASSI, *Indice-guida dei monumenti dell'Umbria*, 175.

⁵¹ GUARDABASSI, p. 233; Photographs and Notes. ⁵² Notes and Photographs.

⁵³ RICCI, II, 58. ⁵⁴ PICCOLOMINI ADAMI, *Guida di Orvieto*, 144; my Notes.

⁵⁵ MOTHES, 759; ROMAGNOLI, *Cenni storico-artistici di Siena*, 53. ⁵⁶ My Notes.

⁵⁷ MOTHES, 701; GUARDABASSI, 301. ⁵⁸ MOTHES, 701. ⁵⁹ RICCI, II, 48.

⁶⁰ LENORMANT, *Gazette Archéologique*, 1883, 29; MOTHES, 626; SCHULZ, *Kunst d. Mittel. in Unteritalien*, I, 332.

⁶¹ SCHULZ, I, 213.

⁶² SCHULZ, II, 264. This may have a pointed style of Oriental origin.

- 60. c. 1200–25. *Napoli*: old Cathedral.⁶³
- 61. 1230. *Celano*: Castle.⁶⁴
- 62. 1227. *Lanciano*: S. Maria Maggiore.⁶⁵
- 63. 1230. *Brindisi*: S. Lucia.⁶⁶
- 64. 1241. *Solmona*: S. Maria della Tomba.⁶⁷
- 65. 1240. *Trani*: Frederick's Castle.⁶⁸
- 66. *Andria*: Castel del Monte.⁶⁹
- 67. 1225–56. *Celano*: S. Francesco.⁷⁰

A careful study of this list of buildings will disclose the existence of several centres of early Italian pointed architecture. The two earliest are in the far north; in Piedmont, where we find the churches of Vezzolano, Alessandria, Vercelli, and Asti, erected between 1185 and 1230; thence the style spread to Lombardy (Como, Milano, Brescia). A second school, which soon became contiguous to that flourishing in Lombardy, seems to have been founded at Bologna toward 1220, and to have spread thence to Parma, Piacenza, and other cities. This school united elements from the north with those from the more southern school which had long been established. This third school (whose centre was in the Papal states) began in about 1175, and included not only such monastic establishments as Fossanova, Casamari, San Martino, and Chiaravalle d'Jesi, but also such cathedrals as Fondi and Piperno. By means of Cistercian colonies, its influence extended as far south as Sicily, and northward into Tuscany and throughout Umbria until it met the school of Bologna. Thus a network of buildings was spread through every province of Italy, and these buildings were civil and civic as well as ecclesiastical and monastic. They can be grouped in schools, either monastic, or geographic, or combining both elements.

There remains but one point to be noticed in connection with pointed Italian architecture, and that is the statement (p. 193), that, with few exceptions, it did not extend far south of Naples. It will be necessary only to examine Schulz's work (*Kunst des Mittelalters in Unteritalien*) to find a fair number of pointed buildings farther south, including Sicily.

I believe that the above answers all the points raised in your letter, and will be found to establish the correctness of the remarks in my review of your book.

A. L. FROTHINGHAM, JR.

⁶³ MOTHES, 626.

⁶⁴ L. DEGLI ABBATI, *Da Roma a Solmona*, 143–4; MOTHES, 637; SCHULZ, II, 85.

⁶⁵ SCHULZ, II, 51; MOTHES, 638.

⁶⁶ MOTHES, 637.

⁶⁷ L. DEGLI ABBATI, 175; SCHULZ, II, 61.

⁶⁸ MOTHES, 637–8; SCHNAASE, VII, 540.

⁶⁹ SCHNAASE, VII, 540.

⁷⁰ L. DEGLI ABBATI, 146; MOTHES, 637.